



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Coln
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/780,879	02/19/2004	Yoshinori Amagasa	F05-161937M/KQK	1985
21254	7590	11/01/2005	EXAMINER	
MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP, PLLC 8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD SUITE 200 VIENNA, VA 22182-3817			BROWN, VERNAL U	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2635	

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/780,879	AMAGASA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Vernal U. Brown	2635	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 February 2004.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 19 February 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

The application of Yoshinori Amagasa for Door Lock Controller and the Method Thereof filed 2/19/04 has been examined. Claims 1-16 are pending.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the determination section must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 1-16, claims 1 and 14 recites the limitation of a request switch for causing the receiver to start receipt of the signal and also recites the limitation of a determination section determining that the receiver is incapable of receiving the signal. It is not understood how the receiver can receive a signal that it is incapable of receiving. The examiner interprets the limitation of the receiver incapable of receiving as the receiver unable to received the transmitted signal due to interference.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwasaki et al. US Patent 6072403 in view of Okada et al. US Patent 6700476.

Regarding claims 1 and 14, Iwasaki et al. teaches a door lock controller (figure 1) comprising: a transmitter (6) for transmitting a signal including a specific identification code (col. 4 lines 55-57); a receiver (3) for receiving the signal transmitted (col. 4 lines 58-59); a request switch (7) for causing the receiver to start a receipt of the signal (col. 6 lines 18-25), wherein a door lock is locked or unlocked through an actuation of the request switch in accordance with the signal (col. 6 lines 44-55);

a storage section (103) for storing a cipher (ID-code) used for unlocking the door lock; and a door lock unlocking section for unlocking the door lock when a coincidence exists between a cipher stored in advance and the cipher inputted through said actuation of the request switch and stored in said storage section (col. 6 lines 46-55). Iwasaki et al. is silent on teaching determining that the receiver is incapable of receiving the transmitted signal. Okada et al. in an art related vehicle remote controller invention teaches detecting when a vehicle receiver is incapable of receiving a transmitted signal because of interference and implement a mean so as

to avoid the interference (col. 7 line 14 –col. 8 line 45) so as to allow the remote operation to be performed on the vehicle.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine that the receiver is incapable of receiving the transmitted signal in Iwasaki et al. as evidenced by Okada et al. because Iwasaki et al. suggests receiving a signal from a transmitter to initiate a control function when the identification code in the received signal matches a preset identification code and Okada et al. teaches a vehicle receiver is sometime unable to received the transmitted code from the transmitter because of interference and Okada et al. further teaches detecting when the vehicle receiver is unable to received the transmitter's transmitted signal and implementing means to overcome the interference problem.

Claims 2-5, 6-7, 12-13, and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwasaki et al. US Patent 6072403 in view of Okada et al. US Patent 6700476 and further in view of Tanaka Patent Application Publication 20030043017.

Regarding claims 2-5, 12-13, and 15-16 Iwasaki et al. teaches the actuation of the request switch 7 (col. 6 lines 44-55) and the storage of a cipher (identification code) (col. 6 lines 46-55) but is silent on teaching an answer back section for informing an operator of the actuation of the request switch and a cipher code entered as a result of repeated actuation of the request switch. Tanaka in an art related vehicle theft prevention system teaches entering a code by the repeat actuation of the switch elements of the keypad and an answer back section for informing the user of the actuation of switch and the indication is provided by an illumination section (roof lamp) (paragraph 0054) in order to inform the vehicle operator that the input of the code has been

accepted. Tanaka also teaches informing the operator by means of a sound (0086) and the indication by sound is an alternative to the visual indication.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have an answer back for informing an operator of the actuation of the request switch and a cipher code entered as a result of repeated actuation of the request switch in Iwasaki et al. in view of Okada et al. as evidenced by Tanaka because Iwasaki et al. suggests the entering of an identification code in order to gain access to the vehicle and Tanaka teaches entering a code by the repeat actuation of the switch elements of the keypad and an answer back section for informing the user of the actuation of switch in order to inform the vehicle operator that the input of the code has been accepted.

Regarding claims 6-7, Iwasaki et al. teaches the actuation of the request switch 7 (col. 6 lines 44-55) and the storage of a cipher (identification code) (col. 6 lines 46-55) but is silent on teaching an answer back indicator provided integrally with the request switch. Tanaka in an art related vehicle theft prevention system teaches an answer back indicator (paragraph 0054) in order to inform the vehicle operator that the input of the code has been accepted. Tanaka further teaches the answer back indicator is provided integrally (connected together) with a request switch 1 as shown in figure 1 for providing a reliable anti-theft system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide and integrated answer back indicator with the request switch because Iwasaki et al. in view of Okada et al. suggests the actuation of the request switch in order to gain access to the vehicle and Tanaka teaches an answer back indicator in order to inform the vehicle operator that the input of the code

has been accepted and the request switch is integrated with the answer back indicator in order to provide a reliable anti-theft system.

Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwasaki et al. US Patent 6072403 in view of Okada et al. US Patent 6700476 in view of Tanaka Patent Application Publication 20030043017 and further in view of Folwell et al. US Patent 4785429.

Regarding claim 8-9, Iwasaki et al. in view of Okada et al. in view of Tanaka teaches providing an answer back indication as described in the response to claims 6-7 above but is silent on teaching a different display depending on whether or not the transmitter is situated within a receivable range of the receiver. Folwell in an art related vehicle range control system teaches providing a different display for indicating whether or not the transmitter is situated within a receivable range of the receiver (col. 9 line 67-col. 10 line 4) in order to inform the vehicle operator when he/she is in the operating range of the remote transmitter.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have a different display for indicating whether or not the transmitter is situated within a receivable range of the receiver in Iwasaki et al. in view of Okada et al. in view of Tanaka as evidenced by Tanaka because Iwasaki et al. in view of Okada et al. in view of Tanaka suggests providing an answer back indication for providing information to the vehicle's operator and Folwell teaches providing a different display for indicating whether or not the transmitter is situated within a receivable range of the receiver in order to inform the vehicle operator when he/she is in the operating range of the remote transmitter.

Claims 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwasaki et al. US Patent 6072403 in view of Okada et al. US Patent 6700476 in view of Tanaka Patent Application Publication 20030043017 and further in view of Hama US Patent Application 20020042292.

Regarding claims 10-11, Iwasaki et al. in view of Okada et al. in view of Tanaka teaches providing an answer back indication as described in the response to claims 6-7 above but is silent on teaching the answer back indicator provides a different display depending on states of the door lock. Hama in an art related wireless communication device teaches providing a different display depending on states of the door lock (paragraph 0075) in order to clearly inform the operator of state of the lock.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for the answer back indicator provides a different display depending on states of the door lock in Iwasaki et al. in view of Okada et al. in view of Tanaka as evidenced by Hama because Iwasaki et al. in view of Okada et al. in view of Tanaka suggests providing indication to the vehicle regarding accesses to the vehicle and Hama teaches providing a different display depending on states of the door lock in order to clearly inform the operator of state of the lock.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vernal U. Brown whose telephone number is 571-272-3060. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-7:00 Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Horabik can be reached on 571-272-3068. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Vernal Brown
October 24, 2005



BRIAN ZIMMERMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER